

EMS Vision Update 2000
Integrating the Pieces
November 29 – December 1, 2000
The Marines' Memorial Club & Hotel
609 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California

Vision Funding Committee
Sessions 1 & 2

Introduction:

Tim Sturgill acknowledged all of the Committee Members.

Agenda: *Discussion of Objectives*

- Objective 1: Secure adequate and stable funding for local EMS agencies and the state EMS Authority for administration, system planning, and evaluation activities.
- Objective 2: Implement a mechanism for periodic review of EMS funding needs and appropriate sources. Establish performance criteria in order to evaluate effectiveness of funding.
- Objective 3: Develop a multidisciplinary task force of federal, state, local government EMS regulators, providers and payers to address first responder and medical transportation needs.

-Comments from Session 1:

1. This objective should be number one on the priority list- it is a local and global issue.
2. Can we take money and redistribute from other sources?
3. Add a new objective for first responder only, with alternative strategies for revenue. There may be some severe restrictions. HICFA will only care about the items in their mandate.
4. Other possible funding sources – taxes, redistribution, foundation, new services (which tend to bring new revenue).

-Comments from Session 2:

1. Funding for first response: Try not to finance a “one size fits all” model for funding.
2. Redistribution was emphasized, rather than new sources of revenue.

- Objective 4: Develop a multidisciplinary task force of federal, state and local government and EMS representatives to define, measure the problem and recommend funding source(s), process(es) and an action plan that would meet the stated needs for disaster, medical and mutual aid planning. If necessary, develop a legislative proposal that responds to the recommended action plan. Develop an advocacy effort to assist with the legislative platform's execution.

- Objective 5: Support legislative efforts to require payers to pay allowable costs in a timely manner.
-Comments from Session 1:
 1. Why was “costs” replaced with “charges?”
 2. It is still ambiguous, because neither is defined.
- Objective 6: Support legislation efforts to require payers to pay for hospital medical evaluation.
-Comments from Session 1 & 2:
 1. It was recommended that this objective be deleted because it already exists.
- Objective 7: Provision of EMS data processing services is a fundamental responsibility of EMS Authority and should be adequately funded. Funding should be continued and coupled to measuring the ongoing effect of the EMS system.
-Comments from Session 2:
 1. Maybe there would not be a local provider to fund this.
- Objective 8: Obtain stable funding for California’s poison control system through a State General Fund increase of \$5.5M annually.
-Comments from Session 1:
 1. How did the poison control system get to be included on the funding objectives?
 2. In the first conference, members from poison control were present, and it got added at that time.
 3. Concern about potential competition.
- Objective 9: Seek legislative funding for hospital services.
-Comments from Session 1:
 1. It was recommended that this objective be deleted.
 2. How can hospital funding services be narrowed rather than deleted?
 -Modified to emergency related services, including physicians, trauma, critical care, pediatric, EMS programs (add on branches as it is modified).
- Objective 10: Explore and obtain adequate state funding to accomplish statewide QI capability to be compatible with national standards.
-Comments from Session 2: